

APPLICATION NUMBER 09/818,423, FILED 03/26/2001, Devabhaktuni Srikrishna

**Regarding claim 13**, the Examiner state that it is unclear how to determine a channel based on responses to the reservation packet. Claim 13 has been amended to more clearly state that assigning the downlink channel based on responses to the reservation packet.

**Regarding claim 14**, the Examiner stated that it is unclear what is "best greater" and whether it is the best. Claim 14 has been amended to state "evaluating a channel with a link quality greater than other channels."


**Regarding claim 35**, the Examiner stated that it is unclear how the first channel and the second channel of the node are based on a number. Claim 35 has been amended in a similar fashion as claim 7.

Regarding claim 12, the Examiner pointed out the lack of antecedent basis of "the default gateway". Claim 12 has been amended to eliminate the antecedent basis.

No new matter has been added by the amendments.

Applicants respectfully suggest that each of the claims presently in the application are distinct over the prior art and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted  
Devabhaktuni Srikrishna

  
Brian Short, Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 41,309  
Date: November 12, 2005  
Ph. No. : 408-888-9830